

REMARKS

The present application was filed on January 29, 1999 with claims 1 through 16. Claims 1 through 16 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as  
5 being anticipated by Papadopoulos et al. (United States Patent Number 5,594,720).

The present invention is directed to an application module interface that allows one or more modules to access voice or data channels in a private branch exchange (PBX) environment that contains one or more B channels (bearer channels) for transmitting voice or data signals, and one or more D channels (signaling channel) for transmitting data. The application module interface provides a  
10 control channel that allows a module to obtain and vary the status and configuration of a telephone terminal. The application module interface provides access to both directions of two B channels (B1 and B2) and one D channel.

Applicants note that the term "each direction" was previously introduced into independent claims 1, 6, 9, 13, and 16 in an earlier office action, but was inadvertently not marked to  
15 indicate that it was an amended term. Applicants have therefore marked the term as an amendment in the present office action.

Independent Claims 1, 6, 9, 13 and 16

Independent Claims 1, 6, 9, 13 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Papadopoulos et al.

Regarding Claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Papadopoulos teaches the frame format  
20 (Fig. 7) that provides a separate channel in each direction (710, 715) of at least one information channel (bearer channel) (see col. 7, lines 45-65).

Applicants note that, in the text cited by the Examiner, Papadopoulos teaches that frames in a cellular communications system contain uplink packets sent from a user to a base station  
25 and downlink packets sent from a base station to a user. As is well known in the art, the packets in a cellular system are *not sent in both directions at the same time*. Thus, the packets sent in each direction are from *different entities* (the user and the base station) and are *not sent in the same frame*.  
Independent claims 1, 6, 9, 13, and 16, as amended, require one or more channels corresponding to a communication, such that a *single entity places data from each of said directions* of said  
30 communication in a corresponding directional channel of a given frame. Support for this amendment

can be found in FIG. 11 which illustrates the Bearer Channel Configurations. In this figure, mode 0 identifies an application utilizing a recorder interface where voice paths, such as those from a telephone conversation, are sent and received from the LIU. In addition, copies of the received and transmitted voices are sent to the module for recording the conversation. Thus, a single entity is placing data from each direction of a communication (the telephone conversation) in a corresponding directional channel of a given frame.

Thus, Papadopoulos does not disclose or suggest one or more channels corresponding to a communication, such that a single entity places data from each of said directions of said communication in a corresponding directional channel of a given frame, as required by independent claims 1, 6, 9, 13, and 16, as amended.

Dependent Claims 2-5, 7-8, 10-12 and 14-15

Dependent Claims 2-5, 7-8, 10-12 and 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Papadopoulos et al. Claims 2-5, 7-8, 10-12 and 14-15 are dependent on Claims 1, 6, 9, and 13, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Papadopoulos et al. because of their dependency from independent Claims 1, 6, 9, and 13 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

All of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1 through 16, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin M. Mason  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 36,597  
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
1300 Post Road, Suite 205  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 255-6560

Date: November 21, 2003